



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,145	01/12/2001	Bill J. Bonnstetter	P04361US1	2367

22885 7590 06/27/2005

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.  
801 GRAND AVENUE  
SUITE 3200  
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER

MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/760,145		BONNSTETTER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Aravind K. Moorthy		2131	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 2 May 2005.
2. Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-39 have been rejected.

***Response to Amendment***

4. As to claim 3, the applicant has added the word "is" to the claim. The examiner withdraws the claim objection.
5. As to claim 35, the applicant has replaced the word "to" for "for". The claim now makes sense. The examiner withdraws the claim objection.
6. As to claim 11, the applicant has changed the dependency from claim 16 to claim 10 as the examiner suggested. There is no longer insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner withdraws the 35 USC § 112 claim rejection.
7. As to claim 12, the applicant has changed the dependency from claim 17 to claim 11 as the examiner suggested. There is no longer insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner withdraws the 35 USC § 112 claim rejection.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**9. Claims 1-3, 5-18, 22, 25-30 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 in view of Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544.**

As to claim 1, D'Alessandro discloses a method of evaluation or assessment of persons, jobs, or employees comprising:

- (a) assigning a password for a respondent [column 6, lines 3-21];
- (c) providing an assessment instrument respondent after verification of password [column 6, lines 26-44];
- (d) receiving responses from the respondent the assessment instrument [column 7, lines 19-59];
- (e) processing the responses into an assessment report [column 8, lines 39-51];
- (f) sending the assessment report to one more locations authorized by the set permissions associated with the password [column 8 line 52 to column 9 line 6].

D'Alessandro does not teach (b) initializing a set of permissions relative to the password.

Art Unit: 2131

Morisawa et al teaches initializing a set of permissions relative to a password [column 6, lines 21-49].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified D'Alessandro so that the assigned password would have had a set of permissions relative to the password.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified D'Alessandro by the teaching of Morisawa et al because it gives the password a functional range based on the type of password [column 2 line 57 to column 3 line 3].

As to claim 2, D'Alessandro teaches managing distribution of documents including assessment instruments, over a wide area network [column 5, lines 44-59].

As to claim 3, D'Alessandro teaches that the wide area network is in a global computer network [column 10, lines 56-59].

As to claim 5, Morisawa et al teaches that the permissions include what can be accessed, opened, changed [column 8, lines 15-39].

As to claim 6, D'Alessandro teaches that the assessment instrument a survey related human performance [column 5, lines 44-59].

As to claim 7, D'Alessandro teaches that human performance relates to job performance [column 5, lines 44-59].

As to claim 8, D'Alessandro teaches that human performance relates to personal performance [column 5, lines 44-59].

As to claim 9, D'Alessandro teaches assigning a password for one or more other entities [column 6, lines 3-21].

As to claim 10, Morisawa et al teaches that the entities are categorized in a hierarchy of different hierarchy levels [column 16, lines 14-62].

As to claim 11, Morisawa et al teaches that each hierarchy level has a set of permissions [column 16, lines 14-62].

As to claim 12, Morisawa et al teaches that the hierarchy levels range from a higher to a lower hierarchy level, and no set of permissions of a lower hierarchy level is broader than any higher hierarchy level [column 16, lines 14-62].

As to claim 13, D'Alessandro teaches that there can be simultaneous access by a plurality of authorized entities [column 5, lines 23-43].

As to claim 14, D'Alessandro teaches a web site [column 6, lines 3-21].

As to claim 15, D'Alessandro teaches that the web site contains an administration site and a survey site [column 6, lines 3-21].

As to claim 16, D'Alessandro teaches that a plurality of entities can have simultaneous access [column 5, lines 23-43].

As to claim 17, D'Alessandro teaches that the password comprises identifying information and a secured access code [column 6, lines 3-21].

As to claims 18 and 30, D'Alessandro teaches that the entities are selected from the set comprising a master distributor, a distributor, a client and a respondent [column 6, lines 6-22].

As to claims 22 and 34, D'Alessandro teaches that the set of permissions associated with a respondent include (a) respond to an assigned assessment instrument.

As to claim 25, D'Alessandro teaches that the variety of reporting options include (a) an activity report of who responded to assessment instruments, (b) automatic electronic delivery of a report to one more addresses, (c) sorting capabilities, (d) summarizations.

As to claim 26, D'Alessandro teaches changing options for the permissions via the wide area network.

As to claim 27, Morisawa et al teaches that more permissions than are assigned an entity cannot be passed on to another entity [column 16, lines 14-62].

As to claim 28, D'Alessandro discloses a method for managing distribution of assessment documents over a wide area comprising:

- (a) providing an assessment instrument for completion by respondents [column 6, lines 26-44];

- (b) assigning a password for an entity having a level of rights [column 6, lines 3-21];

- (d) allowing the entity access web site on a global computer network and enabling the initialized permissions for the entity [column 6, lines 3-21];

- (e) providing an assessment instrument to the respondent [column 6, lines 26-44];

- (f) receiving responses from the respondent to the assessment instrument [column 8 line 52 to column 9 line 6];

- (g) processing the responses into an assessment report [column 8 line 52 to column 9 line 6];

(h) sending the assessment report to one or more locations authorized by the permissions [column 8 line 52 to column 9 line 6].

D'Alessandro does not teach (c) initializing permissions relative to the password based on the level rights for the entity, the permissions including at least one respondent password having permissions based on the level of rights for a respondent.

Morisawa et al teaches initializing permissions relative to the password based on the level rights for the entity, the permissions including at least one respondent password having permissions based on the level of rights for a respondent [column 16, lines 14-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified D'Alessandro so that a set of permissions relative to the password would have been initialized based on the level rights for the entity, the permissions would have included at least one respondent password having permissions based on the level of rights for a respondent.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified D'Alessandro by the teaching of Morisawa et al because it gives the password a functional range based on the type of password [column 2 line 57 to column 3 line 3].

As to claim 29, Morisawa et al teaches that the set of permissions for a given level of rights can not be exceeded by a password associated with a lesser level rights [column 16, lines 14-62].

As to claim 35, D'Alessandro discloses a system for managing assessments comprising:



(a) a plurality of terminals each adapted to access a wide area network, as discussed above;

(b) a central server [column 5, lines 44-59];

(c) software associated with the central server which administers a web site and which provides permissions [column 6, lines 3-21];

D'Alessandro does not teach a password having a set of permissions correlated to a respondent for an assessment survey. D'Alessandro does not teach a password having a set of permissions correlated an entity interested in the respondent's responses to the assessment survey.

Morisawa et al teaches a password having a set of permissions correlated to a respondent, as discussed above. Morisawa et al teaches having an administrative password [column 18, lines 5-49].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified D'Alessandro so that there would have been a password having a set of permission correlated to a respondent for the assessment survey. The party interested in the responses of the assessment survey would have had a password having a set of permission correlated to the password.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified D'Alessandro by the teaching of Morisawa et al because it gives the password a functional range based on the type of password [column 2 line 57 to column 3 line 3].

Art Unit: 2131

As to claim 36, D'Alessandro teaches that the assessment relates to job or personal performance of a human, as discussed above.

As to claims 37 and 38, D'Alessandro teaches that the assessment survey is electronic nature or is hard copy nature [column 7, lines 19-59].

**10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 and Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nagai U.S. Patent No. 6,490,687 B1.**

As to claim 4, the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination teaches passwords, as discussed above.

The D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the password is useable one time and then invalidated.

Nagai teaches passwords that are useable one time and then invalidated.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination so that the assigned passwords were usable one time and then invalidated.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination by the teaching of Nagai because it minimizes the risk that a password will be compromised, the number of login attempts that may be attempted are often limited, so that an attacker cannot keep trying different passwords until successful [column 1, lines 34-41].

**11. Claims 19 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 and Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544 as applied to claims 1 and 28 above, and further in view of Kane et al U.S. Patent No. 6,141,778.**

As to claim 19, the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination teaches (c) ability to manage reports [column 8, lines 39-51].

The D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the set of permissions associated with a master distributor password include (a) ability to create response links and passwords, (b) ability to set up new accounts, (d) ability to change its own and others' account options.

Kane et al teaches the ability to create passwords [column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 16]. Kane et al teaches the ability to set up new accounts [column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 16]. Kane et al teaches the ability to change its own and others' account options [column 7, lines 55-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination so that the master distributor's password would have included the ability to create passwords, set up new accounts, manage reports and the ability to change its own and others' account options.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination by the teaching of Kane et al because it decentralizes control and permits for rapid updates [column 7, lines 55-62].

Art Unit: 2131

**12. Claims 20 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 and Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544 as applied to claims 1 and 28 above, and further in view of Kane et al U.S. Patent No. 6,141,778.**

As to claim 20, the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the set of permissions associated with a distributor password include (a) ability to create response links and passwords, (b) ability to set up new accounts, (d) ability to change its own account options.

Kane et al teaches the ability to create passwords [column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 16]. Kane et al teaches the ability to set up new accounts [column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 16]. Kane et al teaches the ability to change its own account options [column 7, lines 55-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination so that a distributor's password would have included the ability to create passwords, set up new accounts and the ability to change its own account options.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination by the teaching of Kane et al because it decentralizes control and permits for rapid updates [column 7, lines 55-62].

Art Unit: 2131

**13. Claims 21 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 and Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544 as applied to claims 1 and 28 above, and further in view of Kane et al U.S. Patent No. 6,141,778.**

As to claim 21, the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the set of permissions associated with a client include (a) ability to create response links and passwords, (b) ability to manage reports, (c) ability change account options.

Kane et al teaches the ability to create passwords [column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 16]. Kane et al teaches the ability to set up new accounts [column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 16]. Kane et al teaches the ability to change its own account options [column 7, lines 55-62].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination so that a client's password would have included the ability to create passwords, set up new accounts and the ability to change its own account options.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination by the teaching of Kane et al because it decentralizes control and permits for rapid updates [column 7, lines 55-62].

**14. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 and Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cohen-Levy et al U.S. Patent No. 5,423,034.**

As to claims 23, the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the step of sending the reports includes a variety of reporting options. The D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the variety of options includes (a) to whom the report will be sent, (b) when they will be sent, (c) what will be in the report, (d) what form it will be sent.

Cohen-Levy et al teaches a step of sending documents that includes a variety of sending options. Cohen-Levy et al teaches that the variety of options includes (a) to whom the document will be sent, (b) when they will be sent, (c) what will be in the document, (d) what form it will be sent.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination so that there would have been a variety of reporting options. The options would have included (a) to whom the report will be sent [column 15, lines 55-66], (b) when they will be sent [column 19, lines 50-56], (c) what will be in the report [column 20, lines 40-57], (d) what form it will be sent [column 20, lines 8-25].

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination by the teaching of Cohen-Levy et al because it ensures that the appropriate receiver obtains the copy of the report. It ensures that the report will be sent when it has been completed and it gives the user the option of sending it in hard copy or electronic form [column 13, lines 3-61]

Art Unit: 2131

**15. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Alessandro U.S. Patent No. 6,556,974 B1 and Morisawa et al U.S. Patent No. 5,537,544 as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Pisello et al U.S. Patent No. 5,678,042.**

As to claim 39, the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination does not teach that the set of permissions can vary from password to password.

Pisello et al teaches that a set of permissions can vary from password to password [column 19, lines 12-17].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination so that the set of permissions would have varied from password to password.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the D'Alessandro-Morisawa combination by the teaching of Pisello et al because it helps restrict users without having the administrator being concerned with each individual user [column 19, lines 3-11].

Art Unit: 2131

***Conclusion***


16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aravind K Moorthy  
June 23, 2005

AM

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100